UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

The Old Battle

By HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY

The United States of Europe

By EDWIN D. MEAD

Murray of Oklahoma

By HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART XXXIV

VOLUME CVII NUMBER 19

Chicago, July 6, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes—CURTIS W. REESE 291
The Old Battle—HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY 292

ARTICLES—

Self-Control—*Marcus Aurelius* 291
The United States of Europe—EDWIN D. MEAD 294
Murray of Oklahoma—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER 299
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XXXIV 300

POETRY—

Endless Vision—MARTHA LINSLEY SPENCER 298
Ultimate Beauty—MARGARET E. BRUNER 298
Unarmed and Free—MARGUERITE EMILIO 301

THE STUDY TABLE—

Fathers and Sons—JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP 302

CORRESPONDENCE—

Re the MacDonald Government—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 302
Karachi and the Round Table Conference—GOVINDLAL D. SHAH 303
The Churches and the War Game—NORMAN D. FLETCHER 303

THE FIELD—

All-World Gandhi Fellowship 290
Statement of Facts in the Scottsboro Case—*Emergency Defense Committee* 304

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

All-World Gandhi Fellowship

All-World Gandhi Fellowship is formed to cultivate those vital principles *Ahimsa* (non-violence), *Satyagraha* (love-force, soul force, truth-force) and to study their application in the conflicting circumstances of daily experience.

There is a Committee of One Hundred with the following officers: President, Dr. John Haynes Holmes; vice-presidents, Dr. Peter Ainslie, Mrs. Jane S. Bryan, Dr. Will Durant, Rabbi William H. Fineshriber, Mrs. Mary Hanford Ford, Miss Villa Faulkner Page, Dr. J. T. Sunderland, Mr. Charles Frederick Weller, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; director, Mr. Kedar Nath Das Gupta; secretary-treasurer, Miss Alma L. Lissberger. The committee has its headquarters at 105 East 22d Street, Suite 417, New York City.

The Fellowship is enlisting members and is also organizing an All-World Committee of One Thousand. Its official organ, the magazine *Dharma*, brings its message into the smallest hamlets of North, East, South and West, as the mailing list proves. This journal gives illuminating articles by such profound thinkers as Rabindranath Tagore, Dr. Annie Besant, Romain Rolland, Sir John Woodroffe, Aurobindo Ghose, Heywood Broun, Sherwood Eddy, Will Durant, and Mahatma Gandhi.

The following statement is from Mahatma Gandhi's *own words*: of the Vow of Truth (*Satyagraha*) and the Doctrine of Non-violence (*Ahimsa*):

"Not simply as we ordinarily understand it, not truth which merely answers the saying, 'Honesty is the best policy,' implying that if it is not the best policy we may depart from it. Here Truth as it is conceived means that we may have to rule our life by this law of Truth at any cost; that is the Truth which I would like to follow. In our Ashram we make it a rule that we must say 'No' when we mean No, regardless of consequences.

"Literally speaking, *Ahimsa* means 'non-killing.' But to me it has a world of meaning, and takes me into realms much higher, infinitely higher. It really means that you may not offend anybody; you may not harbor an uncharitable thought, even in connection with one who may consider himself to be your enemy. To one who follows this doctrine there is no room for an enemy. But there may be people who consider themselves to be his enemies. So it is held that we may not harbor an evil thought even in connection with such persons.

"This does not mean that we practice the doctrine in its entirety. Far from it. It is an ideal which we have to reach, and it is an ideal to be reached even at this very moment, if we are capable of doing so."

During the winter months the Fellowship gives dinners, meetings and symposiums where the members gather to discuss the affairs of the world and

(*Continued on Page* 303)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVII MONDAY, JULY 6, 1931 NUMBER 19

SELF-CONTROL

It is sufficient for a man to apply himself wholly to the tendence of that spirit which is within him, and truly and really to serve it.

His service doth consist in this, that a man keep himself pure from all passion, from all rashness and vanity, and from all manner of discontent.

Do nothing at all but what reason shall, for the good and benefit of men, suggest unto thee.

Let it be thy earnest and incessant care to perform whatsoever thou art about, with true and unfeigned gravity, natural affection, freedom and justice.

Let thy speech be always grave and modest.

Speak that which seemeth unto thee most just, only speak it kindly, modestly and without hypocrisy.

To keep within the compass of true moderation, is proper to a man who hath a perfect and invincible soul.

To live happily is an inward power of the soul.

Every man's happiness depends from himself.

If I will, it is in my power to keep out of this my soul all wickedness, all trouble and confusion;

To be cheerful and courageous in all sudden chances and accidents;

To love mildness and moderation and gravity;

To do my business thoroughly and without complaint.

The art of true living teaches a man, whatsoever falls upon him, that he may be ready for it and that nothing may cast him down.

—*Marcus Aurelius.*

AWARD

The University of Chicago did itself as well as Mr. S. O. Levinson high honor in awarding the Rosenberger Medal to Mr. Levinson for distinguished public service. Such an award goes far to restore our confidence in the judgment of the committees entrusted with the responsibility of decision in such matters. Mr. Levinson's work in initiating and promoting the idea and the plan for the outlawry of war places him among the most creative minds of all time. We offer hearty congratulations to both Mr. Levinson and the University of Chicago.

A CONGRESS OF CULTURES

The Commission on progress through religion is to be commended for not planning to hold a Parliament of Religions in connection with the Century of Progress Exposition. The Parliament of Religions in connection with the World's Fair of 1893 has become famous in religious history. The great religions of the world and many of their subdivisions were represented by outstanding leaders. The Parliament was so colorful, dramatic and inspiring that it is natural for many people to hope for a second Parliament in connection with the second World's Fair. But in our judgment a second Parliament would be a mistake. The first Parliament was a landmark in religious history. In the very nature of the case it can never be duplicated. It stands alone as a towering monument to the persons and the organizations that made it possible. But a still more significant reason for not holding another Parliament of Religions lies in the development of thought since 1893. Increasingly it is being recognized that the ethnic religions are only phases of cultures. Most important phases they are, and no one can omit them from his calculations and hope to arrive at an adequate understanding of a people or a period. But like all other phases of social life, the ethnic religions must be studied in the light of their total social setting. An understanding of man in his complete social setting, his total thinking and doing, as well as in his physical environment, is a necessity for any one who aims at a planned and controlled future for mankind. But the second World's Fair should include a first Congress of Cultures, which would not be less significant today than was the Parliament in 1893. We are not thinking of a Congress of Cultures merely in terms of exhibits. We are thinking of (1) the interpretation of cultures by their most competent representatives, (2) the consideration of the interrelation of cultures by the most authoritative ethnologists, (3) the planning of a world culture by the most skillful social engineers, and (4) the development of planetary consciousness by the most able prophets. Such a Congress of Cultures would catch the imagination of the world and give the entire fair a much needed spiritual life.

A RADICAL PARTY PLATFORM

The current discussion of a planned social order, together with the efforts of John Dewey and his associates to promote a third party have caused much discussion in the radical and progressive journals of America. There seems to be general agreement that the two old parties offer no hope. Whether a new party can inspire confidence and command leadership will depend largely on the extent to which it incorporates in its platform basic principles and shows how they should be concretely applied. We venture to suggest the following principles and policies as a basis of discussion:

I—Principles

1. The fostering of the maximum personal liberty that is consistent with the well-being of all.
2. The priority of human rights over the rights of things.
3. The recognition of the interdependence of people, and of their valid interests and goals.
4. The possibility and the desirability of an intelligently planned and controlled social economy.
5. The progressive establishment of a cooperative social order as rapidly as the development and spread of knowledge and technique will permit.

II—Policies

1. Freedom of speech, press, and assembly, even for those who would seek to destroy the new social order.
2. The provision of the utmost educational opportunities that persons of varied capacities are capable of using.
3. Social control and use of all basic natural resources.
4. Public ownership and operation of public utilities.
5. Distribution of the national income so as to provide for valid minimum needs, and beyond this all share according to their worth to the social order.
6. Socialization of both preventive and curative medicine so that every man, woman, and child shall be guaranteed the benefit of medical properties and skill.
7. Social insurance against accident, ill health, unemployment, and other forms of misfortune.
8. A widely distributed system of public service bureaus to facilitate employment, and to serve as general channels of social information and exchange.
9. A six hour day and a five day week for both economic and cultural effects; and further reductions as rapidly as machines and techniques make possible.
10. The conduct of international relations, including tariff arrangements, on the basis of respect for the rights and interests of other nations as well as our own; to the end that all peoples shall dwell together in peace and cooperatively build the world-wide commonwealth of man.

NOTE

Readers please notice that following its custom of recent years UNITY will appear bi-weekly during the months of July, August and September. The next issue will appear July 20th. Regular weekly publication will be resumed on October 5th as usual. Subscribers who wish may have their subscriptions extended to cover missing numbers.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Old Battle

President Hoover in his recent Indianapolis address once more put forward a plea for the maintenance practically unmodified of what we are pleased to think of as the old American individualism. He is quite right in insisting that the maintenance of a true individualism is supremely important; only we ought to be sure that we know exactly what we are talking about, and we ought not to let a set of words and a complex of agreeable emotions take the place of sharp perception of facts and of clear-cut thought about them.

The contrast between the "American" and the "foreign" ideal, as he sees it, Mr. Hoover states in these words:

> If we analyze the ideas which have been put forward for handling our great national plan, they fall into two groups. The first is whether we shall go with our American system, which holds that the major purpose of a State is to protect the people and to give them equality of opportunity; that the basis of all happiness is in development of the individual, that the sum of progress can only be gauged by the progress of the individual, that we should steadily build up cooperation among the people themselves to these ends.
>
> The other idea is that we shall, directly or indirectly, regiment the population into a bureaucracy to serve the State, that we should use force instead of cooperation in plans and thereby direct every man as to what he may or may not do.

In an earlier address, at Kings Mountain last October, the President put his notion of our system thus:

> In the American system, through free and universal education, we train the runners, and strive to give them an equal start, the government is the umpire of its fairness. The winner is he who shows the most conscientious training, the greatest ability, the strongest character.

Does either description bear any discoverable relation to what actually goes on in the United States today?

Our system, we are told, "holds that the major purpose of a State is to protect the people and to give them equality of opportunity." Protect them from what? Even if it be only from battle, murder and sudden death, to use the prayer-book phrase, surely the most patriotic American must admit that the record of the past fifteen years is none too reassuring, including as it does a totally unnecessary and wholly disastrous war, and a condition of progressive violence at the hands of gangsters, racketeers, stick-up men and violent criminals of every kind. We have seen an astounding recrudescence of force in every form with a return to private police protection, multiplication of privately owned armored cars operated by privately hired gunmen in our great cities, and a freedom in the carrying and use of firearms that is astonishing in a supposedly civilized community. Competent critics have some times wondered whether we are not in fact witnessing a breakdown of the most elementary function of government, namely, the simple maintenance of civil order—the function which the

President contemplates as practically the only proper work of the state.

If by protection we mean, however, the protection of the individual citizen against fraud, against insecurity and the loss of livelihood, our record is even worse. Every year we see numerous transfers of property, enormous in their aggregate total, by means both legal and illegal, from the little owner to the big, from the ignorant and unwary to the shrewd and the ruthless and the unscrupulous. We see the progressive and unquestionable growth of economic insecurity through the development of impersonal economic relations with no corresponding development of collective provision (the only kind possible) for security against loss of livelihood due to illness, unemployment or old age—a lack only emphasized by the contrast with the systems found in the vastly poorer countries of Europe. So much for the protection of the individual.

And what about equal opportunity? It seems strange for anyone to suggest that such an ideal bears any particular relation to actual practice when it is recalled that one-fiftieth of our people own as much wealth as all the rest put together, that the richest five per cent of them probably get as much income as the poorest fifty, and that the richest quarter have as much as the poorest three-quarters. Despite the growth of communal provision for education and health through free public schools and hospitals, it still remains true that while education beyond the common school costs the rich practically nothing more than the taking, it is available to the poor only at cost of serious and often impossible sacrifices, while health is still for sale, but only the rich (not even the reasonably well off) can afford to pay for it in full measure. But in addition to the handicaps that they enjoy in practically unlimited access to the facilities for health and education, children of the rich and well-to-do begin life with all the advantages of assured social position, first access to business and professional opportunities of every kind, and all the chances contingent on having financial backing readily available. To choose the system of private ownership of productive property under present industrial conditions is, as the Webbs have pointed out, deliberately to choose gross inequality as an essential element of the social scheme. To reconcile that inequality of possessions with equality of opportunity is a problem that has thus far defied the ingenuity of any of the defenders of capitalism.

Even though we were to limit the purposes of the state, then, to the protection of the people and the provision of equal opportunity, it would be easy to show that there must be a vast extension of state functions if those purposes are to be attained. But the conception of the state has changed vastly during the past half century; in the mind of most intelligent thinkers it has become the chief positive agent of social welfare. Instead of the police state of the early nineteenth century, it has become, and is bound increasingly to become, the leading agency through which the mass of the people will seek assurance of the satisfaction of those fundamental wants on which life itself depends. Americans will not go hungry indefinitely in obedience to a formula. They will not continue to live under the black shadow of hunger and homelessness and complete economic disaster forever impending as a result of individual sickness or unemployment or old age when it is perfectly possible through the agency of the government to put an end to such needless suffering. Only through the state, apparently, is it possible today to provide economic security for the mass of the people. That security, I venture to say, the people will insist, and ought to insist, must be provided in an economic system whose power of production vastly surpasses anything ever known before. They will not be held back from such insistence by a formula, particularly one that is completely divorced from facts. But more than that, they are going to continue the development of those newer activities which are so rapidly transforming the state into an agency of social welfare enriching the life of the individual. To try to hold back that development is simply to play King Canute to the social forces of our day. American methods may vary in many particulars from European, but the same general trend of government activities is plain on both sides of the Atlantic. The battle that is joined today is not at bottom between two theories of government; it is not, as President Hoover imagines, between the advocates of voluntary cooperation on the one hand and of government compulsion and tyranny on the other. It is the old, old battle between those who have and would hold the wealth and the power and the glory, no matter what the cost, and the great mass of the people asking assurance of the simple material essentials of wholesome living. In that battle there is a moral principle at issue, and that principle ought not to be obscured by unthinking and emotional talk about American as opposed to foreign ways of doing things. It cannot be held un-American to choose the well-being and security of the mass of the people as against the needless and injurious privilege of the few.

HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY.

The United States of Europe

Aristide Briand is the world's greatest living statesman, greatest in ability, in experience, in vision and practical political power, pre-eminent above all in his comprehension and influence in international organization, especially as concerns Europe. In dedicating to M. Briand his new book on "The Path to Peace," Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler fittingly characterizes him as "Master builder of the new world of nations whose cornerstone is peace." His political career in France has been unparalleled. Eleven times he has been premier of France. He has been the foreign minister through administration after administration, no matter who its head or to what party he belonged. No premier would venture or desire to offer that position of cardinal importance to any other so long as he is willing to hold it. No other man would have been considered for the presidency, to succeed M. Doumergue, if a sudden partisan crisis had not arisen. Had he taken the presidency he would surely have been engrossed in foreign affairs, as his mind is fixed on one great duty. He has guided the foreign fortunes of France during the whole critical period following the World War; and this fact, with the similar ascendency and control in Germany of Dr. Streseman, an international statesman of the same breadth and conciliatory temper as himself, and in high degree inspired by him, it is mainly due that the animosities and jealousies begotten by the war have so rapidly given way to a spirit of mutual trust and true cooperation.

The central purpose and plan of M. Briand today is for a United States of Europe. He gave the first striking expression of this great design as far back as the Locarno conference; but in the last two years it has become the cornerstone of his European policy. He has felt driven to it by the whole situation. The multiplied new states created by the Versailles treaty meant new boundaries, new commercial barriers, new frictions, new hindrances to intercourse. The evils of protective tariffs appear at their worst. The hardships of the agricultural peoples in southeastern Europe through exorbitant interest rates can be relieved only by an enlightened system of international banking. A dozen political and social enterprises of moment can be efficiently carried out by a Europe acting in concert which can not be carried out by isolated and rival nations. The beneficent achievements of the United States of America offer example and incitement for a United States of Europe.

M. Briand is not the first to propose such a European federation. He has himself eloquently commemorated the proposal by the greatest Frenchman of the last century, Victor Hugo. That memorable proposal was made at the International Peace Congress at Paris in 1849. M. Briand has now brought the great dream of Victor Hugo into the realm of practical politics.

To us in America this culmination has a surpassing interest. The Paris Congress of 1849 over which Victor Hugo presided came into being largely through American influence. The principle of federation had here its most impressive and pregnant illustration; and the great leaders of the peace movement in America had for a decade, before 1849 been proclaiming that the principle of federation, which had solved our troubles and become the cornerstone of our national system, was the true method to be internationally applied to secure the peace and order of the world. This pioneering American service, with the founding of the League of Nations itself by our American president, we should proudly recall as a United States of Europe looms on the horizon.

The International Peace Congress at Paris in 1849 was the most important of the four great peace congresses in Europe in the middle of the last century—Brussels, 1848; Paris, 1849; Frankfort, 1850; London, 1851—inspired and largely organized by our American, Elihu Burritt. It was the greatest peace congress ever held, before the Boston Congress of 1904. The hall in which it met seated 2,000 people and was always filled. Burritt says that in its personal composition it was the most remarkable assembly that had ever met on the continent. The English delegation numbered 700, representing nearly all the benevolent societies of the Kingdom. Richard Cobden, who led the delegation, told M. de Tocqueville that if the two steamers conveying them had sunk in the Channel all the philanthropic enterprises of Great Britain would be stopped for a year. Victor Hugo was the president of the congress, and his opening address was probably the most eloquent and inspiring he ever gave. Its most memorable passage was the following:

> If four centuries ago, at the period when war was made by one district against another, between cities and between provinces, some one had dared to predict to Lorraine, to Picardy, to Normandy, to Brittany, to Auvergne, to Provence, to Dauphigny, to Burgundy, "A day shall come when we will no longer make wars, when you will no longer arm men one against another, when it will no longer be said that the Normans are attacking the Picards, or that the people of Lorraine are repulsing the Burgundians; you will still have many disputes to settle, interests to contend for, difficulties to resolve; but do you know what you will substitute instead of armed men, instead of cavalry and infantry, of cannon, lances, pikes, and swords? You will select, instead of all this destructive array, a small box of wood, which you will term a ballot-box, and from which shall issue—what? An assembly, an assembly in which you shall all live, an assembly which shall be the soul of all, a supreme and popular council which shall decide, judge, resolve everything; which shall make the sword fall from every hand and excite the love of justice in every heart; which shall say to each, "Here terminates your right, here commences your duty. Lay down your arms! Live in peace!" And in that day you will all have one common thought, common interest, common destiny; you will embrace each other and recognize each other as children of the same blood and of the same race; that day you will no longer be hostile tribes; you will be a people; you will no longer be Burgundy, Normandy, Brittany, or Provence; you will be France. You will not longer make appeals to war; you will do so to civilization." If, at the period I speak of, some one had uttered these words, all men of a serious and positive character, all prudent and cautious men, all the great politicians of the period, would have cried out, "What a dreamer! What a fantastic dream! How this pretended prophet is acquainted with the human heart! What ridiculous folly! What an absurd chimera!" Yet time has gone on and on, and we find that this dream, this folly, this absurdity, has been realized. And I insist upon this, that the man who would have dared to utter so sublime a prophecy would have been pronounced a madman for having dared to pry into the designs of the Deity.
>
> Well, you at this moment say, and I say it, too, to Austria, to Spain, to Italy, to Russia—we say to them: A day will come when from your hands also the arms you have grasped will fall. A day will come when war will appear as absurd and be as impossible between Paris and London, between St. Petersburg and Berlin, between Vienna and Turin, as it would be now between Rouen and Amiens, between Boston and Philadelphia. A day will come when you, France; you, Russia; you, Italy; you, England; you, Germany—all of you nations of the Continent—will, without losing your distinctive

qualities and your glorious individuality, be blended into a superior unity and constitute a European fraternity, just as Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy, Lorraine and Alsace have been blended into France. A day will come when the only battlefields will be the market open to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas. A day will come when bullets and bombshells will be replaced by votes, by the universal suffrage of nations, by the venerable arbitration of a great sovereign Senate, which will be to Europe what the Parliament is to England, what the Diet is to Germany, what the Legislative Assembly is to France. A day will come when a cannon will be exhibited in public museums just as an instrument of torture is now, and people will be astonished that such a thing could have been. A day will come when those two immense groups, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, shall be seen in presence of each other, extending the hand of fellowship across the ocean, exchanging their produce, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, improving creation under the eye of the Creator, and uniting for the good of all these two irresistible and infinite powers, the fraternity of men and the power of God. Nor is it necessary that four hundred years should pass away for that day to come. We live in a rapid period, in the most impetuous current of events and ideas which has ever borne humanity on. In our ancient Europe, England took the first step and by her example declared to the people, "You are free." France took the second step, and announced to the people, "You are sovereign." Let us now take the third step and all simultaneously—France, England, Germany, Italy, Europe, America—let us proclaim to all nations, "You are brothers."

More than three-quarters of a century has passed since 1849, and the United States of Europe, so impressively prophesied by Victor Hugo, is again being proposed with greater definiteness and devotion than at any intervening time. As Briand and Streseman clasped hands at the conclusion of the Locarno Conference, which went so far to put an end to the jealousy between France and Germany, which has been the bane of Europe, M. Briand said with deep feeling, "This is the beginning of the United States of Europe." This was the opening of the great new chapter; and this word also came from France. On the eve of the ensuing Christmas, 1925, extraordinary interest was created in Geneva by the replies which members of the Council of the League of Nations made to the question put by a Geneva journal: "Will there be a United States of Europe?" M. Paul Boncour, of France, answered: "Yes, we are headed toward the constitution of a European union." Paul Hymans, of Belgium, did not believe in the probability of a political entity like the United States of America, but thought that a European union would take the form of a series of ententes based on peace and co-operation. This meant the destruction of economic barriers. Dr. Edward Benes, the premier of Czecho-Slovakia, said: "The Locarno accords, the general extension of arbitration, and the political and social reorganization which has marked Europe in recent years, all tend toward the constitution of a United States of Europe." Austen Chamberlain, the British foreign secretary, contented himself with remarking that the Locarno agreements strengthened the League of Nations.

Meantime there has been a notable popular crusade in Europe in behalf of this federation. It has been led by Count Coudenhove Kalergi, with warm response in several countries. His books and pamphlets have shown great ability and have had wide circulation. The great conference at Vienna which he inspired was attended by many leading statesmen and had marked influence. He constantly appeals to American precedent. Our federal system, our supreme court, above all the complete free trade among the states in our great area, have given our people a security, a contentment and a prosperity which furnish a commanding lesson for Europe. What seems to us the amazing outcry in Europe over the natural proposal of Germany and Austria for free trade or a customs union between themselves is a revelation of the critical significance of the whole tariff question and of the right importance of M. Briand's proposal to deal with it on a general continental basis.

Unhappily this new proposal of a United States of Europe was in many quarters inspired by the thought that such a union was necessary as a common defense of the European nations in the unequal competition with America. Depleted as are their powers and resources by the fearful strain and losses of the war, they need every fair indulgence in their industrial and commercial dealings with us if they are to reinstate themselves. It is only by their products that they can pay their debts and get upon their feet. But here comes the tariff barrier; and as concerns the American and European stand in the matter, we have made the situation worse since 1925. Hence the thought of an economic United Europe, a customs union, with free trade among the members and a protective tariff against the competing outside nations. Cobden, the wisest international man who ever spoke English, saw clearly this constant menace to international peace and friendship from tariff inequities and commercial privilege. A United States of Europe called into being in rivalry with the United States of America and in protection against it is not what Victor Hugo was talking about. This is not the way for Europe and America to proclaim "We are brothers!" But the United States is more responsible than any other nation for the existing strain; and here is the paramount duty to inaugurate this imperative reform.

At the Paris Peace Congress of 1849 there were twenty-three American delegates, thirteen of whom were from Massachusetts. The names of these American delegates, crossing the ocean in their devotion to the cause constitute a roll of honor. From Massachusetts, Rev. Joseph Allen, Rev. William Allen, Albert Brown, William W. Brown, Elihu Burritt, Henry Capp, Rev. James Freeman Clarke, Rev. Elnathan Davis, G. W. Messenger, Rev. Cyrus Pierce, Nathan Richardson, Amasa Walker and A. C. White; and there were delegates from Connecticut, New York, Maryland, South Carolina, Ohio, and Wisconsin. At the London Peace Congress in 1843, which preceded the four great congresses here spoken of, which was the first international peace congress ever held, and which owed its inspiration to the suggestion by Joseph Sturge, of Birmingham, to our American Peace Society in Boston, we had an equal number of American delegates; and at the London Peace Congress of 1851 we had sixty.

The American delegates at Paris in 1849 were welcomed with peculiar warmth, and at the close of the congress the English members gave them a public breakfast in the famous old Tennis Hall at Versailles, identified so memorably with the early scenes of the French Revolution. The principal address of greeting was by Mr. Cobden, who at one point said to his American friends that "if he could speak as he wished, he would say to them, that if they would make America what she should be, what she might be, what he trusted she would be, then they must crush the war spirit before it had time to arrive at maturity. Talk of glory?" he

exclaimed, "The Americans had no glory to gain by war but what they would find had been eclipsed by those who had gone before them. Rather let them try to raise up patriots, philanthropists, authors, and artists; let them try to raise up more such men as they had sent at that season, and that would constitute a glory far more precious and enduring than all that could be gained by the most successful war." It will be remembered that when Cobden spoke, in 1849, the Mexican War, perhaps the most iniquitous war in our history—"one of the most unjust wars," General Grant pronounced it, "ever waged by a stronger against a weaker people"—was hardly two years behind.

The American responses to the English speeches were by Dr. Allen, former president of Bowdoin College, James Freeman Clarke, and Elihu Burritt. "What may we not expect," said Burritt, "when the hands of France, England, and the United States shall be united and they shall go forth together to vanquish the insane and unnatural enmities which divide and embitter other nations! For myself, I believe that a few more peace parliaments like this will not only unite England, France, and America, but all the civilized nations of the earth, in the pacific dispositions and relations of one vast commonwealth. We hope that most of those present on this occasion may meet again next year, at some town on the Rhine, to raise our white standard of peace in Germany."

In the congress itself the two weightiest and most constructive addresses were made by Elihu Burritt and Amasa Walker, both Americans and both Massachusetts men. Both of them spoke in behalf of the following resolution:

> The congress recommends all the friends of peace to prepare public opinion in their respective countries for the formation of a congress of nations, whose object it shall be to frame a code of international laws on just principles, and to constitute a supreme court, to which should be submitted all questions relating to the reciprocal rights and duties of nations.

World organization—that was what the great Americans emphasized at all of those great European peace congresses. Others talked of the horrors of war, the cost and waste of war, the menace of armaments, just as men talk now, and under existing circumstances are compelled to talk; but Elihu Burritt and his associates from Massachusetts talked about the way in which war must be supplanted, if it ever is to be supplanted, by international conference and international law. "We have listened," said George Beckwith, the secretary of the American Peace Society, at the London Congress of 1851, "to very eloquent denunciations of war; but the practical question before us is, How can you get rid of this terrible evil." He believed, and Elihu Burritt and Amasa Walker believed, that there was a way. "We ask nations," said Beckwith, "to settle their disputes in essentially the same way that individuals do. That is invariably in one of two ways—by amicable agreement between the parties or by reference to a third party as umpire." His London speech was mainly an appeal for international arbitration. He had been to the Senate in Washington the year before to present the American Peace Society's petition that our government should urge all nations with which it had treaty relations to incorporate in all treaties provision for the arbitration of any disputes arising between them. He had not expected a cordial response; but the chairman of the Senate committee who received the petition promptly replied: "You are right. Not only is your object unquestionably good, but the measure you suggest is in substance the very thing we have all along been doing in our Republic, the identical principle on which the members of our confederacy, these thirty-one State sovereignties, adjust their own disputes with each other; and the extension of this principle to our intercourse with other nations, so far from being at all objectionable, must work well with our arrangements for the preservation of peace at home." It is mournful to contrast this utterance in the Senate eighty years ago with dominant sentiment in the Senate last winter and the failure of every effort to secure approval of our entrance into the World Court, to which practically every civilized nation in the world now belongs.

The word of the Senate in 1850 was, of course, the truth of the matter. The principles of our own national federation, which has worked so beneficently for us, are the great precursors and arguments for international federation. It was logical and fitting that the proposal for this in those old European peace congresses should come from the American delegates. When Burritt spoke at Paris, the prophetic project of William Ladd had only just been launched. "More than fifty essays have been written upon it," said Burritt in his address, "and hundreds of public meetings have been held in its favor, and numerous petitions have been addressed to the legislatures of different States, asking them to induce the Federal Government at Washington to propose to the other governments of the civilized world the convocation of a congress of nations for the purpose of establishing a well-defined code of international law and a high court of adjudication to interpret and apply it in the settlement of international disputes. We have believed this indispensable for the order and peace of nations, and we have deemed the establishment of an authoritative code of international law, which should govern the decisions of the tribunal, the first and most important step."

This brings us into the very atmosphere and spirit of Geneva. Indeed, Burritt proposed that his Congress of Nations should meet "at some convenient town in Switzerland, or in some other central territory which should be considered neutral ground." Besides creating a world court the congress should digest a plan for establishing a uniform system of weights, measures, moneys and rates of postage, and other facilities for the social and commercial intercourse of nations. It is the very anticipation of the Assembly of our League of Nations. Burritt speaks of it as a "holy alliance to banish war and all its animosities and miseries from the community."

Amasa Walker, who followed Burritt at the Paris Congress in support of his resolution in behalf of world organization as the remedy for war, was the father of General Francis A. Walker and was as able and enlightened a man as his illustrious son. "A Congress of Nations," he said, "has long been contemplated in the United States. For more than twenty years it has been a constant theme of discussion. A prize of $1,000 was offered some years ago for the best essays on the subject, and a volume of these essays has been published and widely circulated. The legislature of Massachusetts passed a resolution commending the matter to the attention of the National Congress, where a resolution in its favor has been introduced. Our friends of peace have come to regard it as indispensable to the permanent pacification of the world. It seems to them

absolutely necessary that the different nations of the civilized world should come together by their representatives and see what can be done by associated effort. It seems to them that this is the next step towards a higher and more Christian civilization; that union and co-operation have become necessary to the improvement and elevation of the human race." The object of this "confederation to secure permanent peace and fraternal intercourse" was to be procured by "a congress to enact laws and a high court of equity to adjudicate in accordance with those laws." The congress should assemble once in two or three years "to enact such laws and regulations as the exigency of the confederated nations may require."

"What nation," he asked in conclusion, "will stand out and refuse to enter this League of Peace? What government in Europe could do this? What people would submit to needless oppression? What nation in Europe wishes to increase or continue its present taxation? What government has surplus funds to waste upon the war system? Self-interest will compel all civilized nations to come into this fraternal league. If a few of the leading nations come into the measure, none can afford to stay out. We propose to bind together the great commonwealth of nations by such ties of interest and such common sentiment of fraternity as all the petty rivalries and occasional differences which arise between different States shall never be able to rend asunder."

This is almost precisely the program, often in almost the precise words, of Andrew Carnegie in his rectorial address at St. Andrew's, on "A League of Peace," in 1905. It is essentially the very program of Woodrow Wilson at Paris in 1919, put into operation in the League of Nations at Geneva. It was commonly spoken of in Europe at the time of the great peace congresses, more than three-quarters of a century ago, as "the American way." Elihu Burritt and Amasa Walker indeed deemed it wise to propitiate European pride by pointing out that this "American idea" was but an old European idea broached long before and now developed into a movement. Burritt began his Paris address with these words: "Today are fulfilled the aspirations of that man of courageous faith and extended aspiration, William Penn," paying tribute to Penn's famous "Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe," published in 1693, which was a scheme for an alliance or compact among the different States, with a "General Diet" in which each should be represented by deputies, and all differences should be settled equitably, without recourse to arms. He also appealed to the similar proposal of Emeric Cruce, in France itself, earlier in the same century, almost at the same time as Henry IV's "Great Design." At the Frankfort Congress, the next year, Burritt, repeating his plea for the American proposal, said: "The name of Immanuel Kant is identified with it, and it would be an act of injustice to the memory of that remarkable man to ascribe to the American mind a plan which he had presented to the world with such clearness and force before it was ever mentioned on the other side of the Atlantic."

Immanuel Kant's way had become "the American way"; his prophetic and commanding idea had become the practical program of the American Peace Society. This program was inspired by the same spirit which animated the founders of our Republic at the beginning. The year before the Paris Congress, Richard Cobden had brought before Parliament the first proposal for international arbitration as a British policy and had won 81 votes for it. At the London Congress in 1851, George Beckwith, the secretary of the American Peace Society, devoted almost his entire speech to international arbitration; the year before, he had urged upon Congress a resolution, to incorporate a provision for arbitration in all our foreign treaties. But Samuel Adams, in behalf of the Massachusetts Legislature, had done this same thing two generations before, just after the Revolution, while we were still living under the Articles of Confederation. Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin were the pre-eminent peace men and international men among the statesmen of their age. In utter defiance of their spirit and of their express principles, politicians here today shield and fortify themselves in policies of an aloof and selfish nationalism behind some old warning of Jefferson's, which they usually ascribe to Washington, against "entangling alliances;" and they do not state or recognize the circumstances which justified the warning then and do not justify it now.

History shows no irony more glaring, no "great refusal" greater, than the course of the United States in the period since 1919, when our American President at Paris secured the adoption of the covenant of the League of Nations. Every principle of our history, our high tradition, our federal system, and our leadership for a century in the great movement for international peace and organization, every consideration of national pride and international obligation, commanded us to first place in the League of Nations and the World Court. Instead, with our base suspicions, our partisan rivalries and finical dialectics, we have made the sublime cause of our epoch the football of petty politics, and become the drag and damper upon Europe and the world in its great struggle onward and upward. We have delayed the world's progress by a decade, while other nations have faithfully co-operated in "the American way"; and at the end of the shameful chapter we shall take the last place, where we should have had the first, in the United States of the World. I say we have done it. But it is not true that, "We, the People" have done it. The people have been misrepresented and betrayed by the controllers of party politics and tripped by unhappy constitutional provisions. The people will undo the wrong.

Victor Hugo in 1849 did not speak of a United States of the World. He thought of a United States of Europe, which should take its place beside the United States of America in brotherly co-operation for the world's peace and order. Elihu Burritt and Woodrow Wilson and Immanuel Kant made a bolder definition and a larger synthesis; and as a matter of fact the League of Nations has come before the League of Europe. One does not exclude the other. I look to see regional international courts in Asia, in South America, in Europe itself alongside and subsidiary to the World Court at The Hague. There are real and important functions which may be most effectively discharged by regional organization. We have a Pan-American union. A Pan-European union may be as useful and necessary. But all such unions will be within the great world union; and the purpose of all will be the realization of Victor Hugo's commanding prophecy of universal human brotherhood.

To this end the cardinal imperative at this hour is the most cordial cooperation between the United States and Europe, with a generosity on our part commensur-

ate with our wealth and power. This must be shown in two ways,—by promoting instead of hindering Europe's trade with us, and by the boldest course in a general cutting down of naval armaments, which our complete security makes possible for us, and which is the prime necessity for the European nations, unable longer to bear the burden. The undeniable and pervasive feeling in Europe is that our commercial course has not been magnanimous, but selfish. Admiral Sims, who knows Europe so well, said in a recent address in Boston that the United States is "the most hated of all nations." This is often said, and there is danger of exaggeration. Be that as it may, what Admiral Sims further said is true,—that "loss of three cruisers with all hands would cause fewer deaths than tariffs ruining another nation's industries and its workers." He spoke with equal sarcasm of the London naval conference, and the similar conferences; and here his word as that of a distinguished naval officer has weight. After the opening rhetoric about good will, he said, the delegates "immediately went about disgusting scraps over two more cruisers here, a battleship there, and the like." This was the tragedy of the London Conference; and it was doubly ironical because of the solemn pledge that the Kellogg Pact should be made the cornerstone of the Conference, which pledge we completely ignored, refusing the cut in battleships which England and the other powers were ready to make, compelling them to keep up a building scale which, while we can afford, they can not.

We come here to the very crux of the European situation. In these last weeks we have been in Paris, Geneva and Berlin, in many German centers and I write in London. The present conditions in Europe cannot go on without terrible disaster. The situation is far graver than during our last visit four years ago. The poverty is universal and devastating; and the feeling of helplessness and hopelessness is nearing despair. War has been the great robber; and the burden of armaments cannot longer be borne without explosion. President Hoover's arraignment of the great armaments in his recent address to the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce was hailed everywhere here as his most important utterance. But why, all urge, is America's preparedness budget the greatest in the world? Why does she, the one absolutely secure nation, keep up the costliest navy in the world, outclassed by none? The demand for the drastic cutting down of all navies and armies, and the application of their awful and useless cost to the welfare of the people, is the loudest demand in Europe at this hour. Hundreds of thousands of people everywhere are rolling up petitions to their governments to take every step to prevent any failure at the Disarmament Conference at Geneva next year; and to frown upon every move and every word that would condone any trifling or delay. To this end every effort of the peace party in America also should from now on be directed.

This brings us back to M. Briand. The Kellogg peace pact was the expansion by us of M. Briand's proposal to us for a treaty simply between France and ourselves renouncing war and pledging the settlement of all disputes between us by peaceful means. Our government felt that it must treat all nations alike, that it could not reject the French proposal,—and hence the Kellogg pact, sponsored by us and adopted by 60 nations. Its clear corollary is the rapid reduction of the instruments of war to match the rapidly growing and already so complete provision of the agencies of law and justice for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The pervasive feeling in Europe is that we are doing nothing in the way of leadership in carrying out the pledge which we sponsored or of advancing its control in international policies. Right here is the place for bold initiative by the United States. We may count confidently on loyal and glad cooperation by any United States of Europe which M. Briand may be able to help to birth.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Endless Vision

I cannot paint the rainbow with my brush,
That arches summer skies,
Nor can I imitate the thrush
When summer twilight dies;

But I can worship with the song,
And praise the glowing worth
Of all the rainbows that belong
To harmonies of earth.

I cannot make a perfect thing,
However hard I strive—
My work, imperfect, I shall bring
Though never I arrive;

For when I reach an ideal sought
Of handicraft or pen,
The promised thing, which has been wrought,
Proves less than vision then.

For though we try with eager zest
To work the pattern through,
The better still is not the best—
And effort fails anew.

To reach for more than we can grasp
Anticipates desire,
To wish for more than we can clasp
Is always to aspire.

MARTHA LINSLEY SPENCER

Ultimate Beauty

I searched for beauty in the hills,
I gazed on cliff and stream;
And yet it seemed a far-off thing:
A vague, intangible dream.

I turned unto the works of art,
That beauty snared by man;
But still I knew beyond me lay
A chasm yet to span.

Is there, I asked, no ultimate
High beauty of the heart
Where pain and ecstasy are one,
Gleaming, a thing apart?

Time passed—I turned my foot-steps toward
A carnival's bright glare,
I loitered by a tinseled booth,
The face above, once fair,

Over and over cried her gauds
To every passer-by;
What weariness was in her voice!
It seemed a heart's deep cry.

And one brief interval her eyes
Held mine and through a mist
Of tears I learned that beauty has
Strange ways of keeping tryst.

MARGARET E. BRUNER

Murray of Oklahoma

We have a governor in Oklahoma. Other states elect governors too. But we elect them and oust them. Two have been ousted. One impeached governor was saved by a single vote. The three others elected since statehood have had impeachment proceedings started against them. Murray's chances, therefore, of being impeached are splendid. Perhaps he will be disappointed if some such move is not made.

My first and only glimpse of William H. Murray was at the Inaugural Ball. I shall never forget it. It was a classic among such events. Late in the afternoon an acquaintance called me up to ask if he should wear a tuxedo. I assured him that I understood it was not a dress affair even in that sense.

I got into my best business suit and wore a brand new double breasted blue overcoat in honor of the occasion, but I soon discovered I might as well have appeared in shirt sleeves and suspenders, for every type of costume from overalls to dinner coats was worn. A milling crowd of thousands jammed the capitol so that one could hardly move in that great building. There was no dancing in evidence. If one could budge at all one was lucky. To protect an elderly woman in our party another man and I formed a wedge against the mass of people. It was for the most part a hot, good-natured, sweating mob, which swayed back and forth at the slightest suspicion of "something doing."

While we were waiting for the Grand March to begin, a slight, inoffensive man, far past middle age, with a badge on his coat lapel appeared at my side anxiously looking for the Governor. He informed me he was a colonel, a lost colonel on the Governor's staff. He stetched his thin neck and peered. Invested with the most important recognition of his life, the very size of the crowd defeated his attempt to exhibit his newly acquired dignity.

Hours off schedule the Grand March began. The mob pressed in on all sides. The march started, I suppose, somewhere off on a distant floor, the state militia clearing the path. Finally, I got my glimpse of Governor Murray in the procession. He looks human and jovial, a man distinctly of the people. I looked with interest at the famous spreading Murray moustache. There are campaign stories. It seems that "Alfalfa Bill" prefers to eat his pancakes, syrup-soggy, with his fingers, his facial shrubbery catching the drippings.

I had planned to get an interview with Murray for this article, but I learned my chances were extremely poor during the battling session of the legislature. And then I gave up the idea completely when I read this morning about the plight of a lady colonel on the Governor's staff, the beginning apparently of a "Battalion of Death" in Oklahoma. Two days he has kept her waiting for an interview. She is now considering resigning her military honor.

There is more than a touch of vindictiveness in our Governor for all his smiling waves of the hand to the dear people. Murray fired a barber, employed in that capacity for years at the Capitol, for nicking his gubernatorial physiognomy during the course of shaving. Tradition has it that Murray, after his bloody session with the barber, stalked down a corridor of the state-house in high dudgeon kicking spittoons right and left!

There is nothing, however, traditional about the Governor's joviality in entertaining at dinner. Walter Harrison of the Oklahoma City *Times* wrote in his editorial column that a "friendly senator" had told him that Murray had "stood on his head with his hat on" in the executive mansion living room for the benefit of the dinner guests of the evening.

One of the first serious moves of the Governor was to propose in his inaugural address an office building supplied with beds, on the grounds of the capitol. His idea was unique. Through this procedure, he explained, he would protect simple, honest and unwary members of the house and senate from wine, women and lobbyists. They could go to bed "alone" in these monastic quarters, and think, uninterrupted by the allurements of vice, on great matters of state.

The Governor's interest in morals led him not long ago to charge immorality and misuse of funds at our state university. A very sedate and painstaking committee of the senate went to work. The testimony of many witnesses was taken down, some 1,308 pages and exhibits in proportion. Of course our professors and students are as "moral as any in the land" and the chief executive was politely advised by the committee of distinguished senators to keep hands off the state university and leave its administration to the board of regents and its president.

But the Governor does not take a licking easily. He went after the scalp of Frank Buttram, his millionaire opponent for office. He has brought about the resignation of Buttram as member of the board of regents of the university. The university is up in arms at this second visitation from the gubernatorial critic of higher education who believes that sabbatical years are a waste and that professors should teach long hours in the fashion of the eight hour day.

One after another the heads of "Alfalfa Bill's" political enemies are being chopped off. Lew Wentz, reputed to be the state's richest man, has given splendid service as a member of the state highway commission. However, he is a Republican. It seems too that Wentz has saved the state scores of thousands on cement contracts which the Governor's appointees planned to let to the Oklahoma Portland Cement Company without competition. It has been suggested that the Governor "stood on his head" again to divert attention from this fact. Lew Wentz is the noble son of common sense who, when his friends wanted to draft him to run for governor, remarked that he could see no honor in having his picture displayed along with the other ousted governors of the state. Off with his head! He has too much sound sense to be in any way associated with the present administration.

The worst feature in this political head-chopping is the introduction of the spoils-system. To have opposed Murray's political ambitions means disaster. Scores are losing their jobs.

Edith Johnson, our leading columnist, points out:

> Half of the forty-four employees discharged by the highway department are widows, many of them supporting families. Sam Hawks, chairman of the commission has announced that there will be fifty more dismissals.

Miss Johnson further observes:

> Ever since he went into office Governor Murray has been ruthlessly discarding our best and most faithful public servants because he does not happen to like them or because he thinks

they have not been "for" him from the first. And if rumor may be credited, he has made but a good beginning.

She mentions J. B. Thoburn, curator of the state historical society whose wife died of heart failure when she heard of her husband's dismissal from office, and says in conclusion:

> Unemployment is added to unemployment, suffering is added to suffering, despair to despair. Where is the end?
>
> Murray announced his chief policy!
>
> Tax reform, take the burden off the homes and farms of the state; economy, efficiency and honesty in the state government.

Soon after coming into office he told ten thousand teachers, poorly paid, that they would either have to accept his measure providing for a ten percent tax on the salaries of all public servants or a reduction in their pay. Writing of Murray's tax policy in the Oklahoma City *Times,* W. M. Mills says:

> There followed the enactment of the state income tax that reaches so much further down the lists of wage earners to take its toll. Even though the senate increased the exemption slightly above the original measure, approved by the governor, the exemption is still little enough to tax many of the poorly paid and under privileged among our citizens. It taxes those who have no property and no prospect of acquiring property, to ease the *ad valorem* tax paid by the land owners . . . Indeed, it seems likely that he accepted the Senate compromise because he feared to go before the people on that issue, as he has frequently threatened to do.

The acumen of our "Bill' in dealing with the criminal is on a par with his other serious performances. Perhaps he is retaliating for the number of criminals that found refuge here during the early days. At any rate he paroled three men with the requirement that they spend their time outside the state.

Perhaps I should introduce a word, before going on to the transcendent ambition of "Alfalfa Bill," that will help to explain the power of men like Murray in Oklahoma. We afford the nation amusement and are looked upon as the clown state of the union to the great disgust of a substantial body of our citizens who are as powerless as New York in the hands of Tammany.

Oklahoma has become the home of an exceptionally large number of failures who have drifted in here from other states, lured by its prosperity. We have also an undiscriminating radical element. Many of them were recruited from the industrial disputes of the east, miners and railroad men who took up the free land here when the state was opened for settlement. At one time the socialist vote was approximately 50,000 with a claimed party membership of around 90,000. We have in addition our share of unemployment and the restlessness that goes with it. Besides we have great numbers of tenant farmers whose plight is bad enough in normal times but almost intolerable in the time of drought such as we have just experienced.

Any man running for office who can bring a ray of sunshine into the darkened lives of these people gets their votes. It doesn't matter that he has a bag of tricks which he draws upon for the occasion. The ability to speak fluently and promises impossible of fulfilment win the votes. All these forces of discomfort and discontent rallied to Murray who spoke movingly and forcibly of what he was going to do to the rich to make things easier for the poor.

"Bill's" own paper, the *Blue Valley Farmer,* is proposing him for President. This climaxes the egotism of the funny man who governs in Oklahoma at the present moment. Seventeen reasons are given out by a Murray confidant in support of the Governor's qualifications for being the next Democratic standard-bearer. Murray surveys himself, let it be noted, not only as presidential timber but also as a second Lincoln! Our Governor may be the avatar of the immortal Lincoln as he doubtlessly thinks himself to be, but some of us are a bit skeptical in view of his performances in office and could name seventeen reasons for saving the country from "the second coming of Lincoln."

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day," here published for the first time in English*]

CVIII

1.

Man should not weary in efforts against all that screens love from view. But it often happens that for a long time a man cannot overcome sins, snares and superstitions, but falls from one into another; and he loses heart and despairs and ceases his efforts, often just at the time when it would have cost him only a little exertion to win his freedom. One should never weaken. The whole life of man lies in efforts toward the good. And in the effort lies the reward.

2.

A man says of himself, "I am hungry, I am exhausted"; or he says, "I understand or I am to blame." The first "I" is different from the second. It is the physical "I" that is hungry; the spiritual "I" that understands and considers itself to blame. Sometimes the spiritual "I" is agreed with the bodily, but sometimes the physical "I" wants one thing and the spiritual another. The physical "I" wants to eat, while the spiritual "I" wants to give its food to the hungry.

In the beginning of life, the physical "I" is stronger than the spiritual, but the longer a man lives, the more the spiritual gains power over the physical. The physical "I" considers various things as its own —houses, fields, cattle—and it says, "This is mine"; and likewise of the body it says, "My body." But the spiritual "I" does not consider anything on earth its own, and does not say of anything, "This is mine"; nor does it count as its own even the body in which it dwells. The spiritual "I" only counts its soul its own. And thus all through life the dispute goes on between the spiritual self and the physical. But the longer a man lives, the weaker the physical "I" becomes, the more it stops calling those things its own, of which it formerly said, "This is mine." And at the last it even ceases to call its body its own.

In this liberation of the spiritual self from the physical lies all the life of man.

And the sooner a man understands that his physical self is temporary, transient, that his true, eternal life lies in his efforts toward the liberation of his spiritual self from the covering of the body, which hides it from itself—the happier will he be.

3.

Life consists in efforts to free ourselves from sins, snares and superstitions. The greater the effort, the greater the good attained. Hence the felicity of man lies in his efforts.

4.

However unnoticeable and insignificant your share in the general improvement of life in the world may be, still this share is indispensable, because out of such insignificant, imperceptible efforts on the part of the multitude, is made up the whole of that movement toward good from which you benefit. Therefore do not lie back in the traces, but strain at them, even though no one sees you or goads you on.

5.

People say that you can put no trust in your own efforts, in yourself. This is untrue. Only one who regards man as a group of mechanical forces, subject to the laws governing matter, can say that man should not put trust in himself. For every religious person, man is a living force, a Divine spark, stored in the body and dwelling in it. God sent this particle of himself into my body, with the hope that it should do his work. How can I fail to trust in it? God puts his trust in me: how can I fail to trust that which he trusts? The life of man lies in his activity. Man can save or lose his own soul. The whole teaching of Christ is only a teaching of what a man should *do:* that he should not say, "Lord, Lord," but should fulfil the commandments, should be perfect as the Father is perfect, be merciful, be meek, be self-sacrificing. Who will do all this, if man himself will not? And in order to do it, he must have trust that he will do it.

6.

There is no halting on the path of self-perfection. As soon as you feel a greater interest in the outer world than in your own soul, you have come to a halt; the world is moving past you, while you stand still.

CIX

1.

As a candle only shines when the wax of which it is made is being spent, so life is only real when it is being spent for others.

2.

You should train yourself so that when you meet with a man you will say to yourself, "I shall think only of him, and not of myself."

3.

How deep are the words of Lao-Tse, that perfection, benefits, meaning and use lie only in emptiness: in the hub of the wheel, in a vessel, in a doorway. For man, the highest strength and benefit and welfare lie in recognizing as the foundation of his life, that which has no form whatsoever, that which appears to be nothing, emptiness.

4.

Nothing shows that our real life lies in self-denial so clearly as the need that many people feel for sacrifice and suffering. This yearning comes only at times, but it is none the less part of our nature. The fact that it often has no basis in reason, serves as further proof that it is natural.

5.

Selfishness, when it passes certain bounds, becomes a mental disease. Carried to the highest degree, it is manifested as the mental disease called the "delusion of grandeur."

CX

1.

Strive not to think well of yourself. If you cannot think badly of yourself, you may be sure it is already a bad thing that you cannot think badly of yourself.

2.

If a man desires humility, he also desires that which makes men humble. And humiliation makes men humble. Hence a man who desires humility, not only does not fear humiliation, but accepts it as a trial and an encouragement to humility.

3.

If you want to learn the full joy of a good deed, do good secretly—and forget about it. Only then will your good deed be not outside but within.

4.

Dissatisfaction with self is the indispensable condition of rational life. This dissatisfaction alone stimulates you to work over yourself.

5.

Lack of humility, of submissiveness, causes torment. Hence, on the contrary, submissiveness and humility make blessed the yoke of life. There is nothing more beneficial to the soul than humiliation joyfully accepted. As a warm rain after the blazing, wasting sun of self-satisfaction, humility refreshes the soul.

6.

Every comparison of oneself with others for self-justification is a snare that hinders the good life and its chief task—perfection.

7.

Compare yourself only with the highest perfection you can imagine, and not with people who seem inferior to you.

(*To be continued*)

Unarmed and Free

[A Hymn]

Take from our eyes, O God of Peace,
The rosy lens through which we see
In files of armed and marching men,
A glamor and a pageantry.
Their warlike trappings, clean and bright,
Will soon be stained with blood and rust;
In futile war these men will die,
The victims of our weak distrust.

Make us to hear in martial strains,
The lilt of fife, the beat of drum,
No thrilling lure, no throbbing life,
But messages of martyrdom:
The crash of arms, the whistling shell,
The ceaseless thunder and the din,
While on the field our finest youth
Is sacrificed to our great sin.

With eyes that pierce the outward show,
With ears that hear the undertone,
May we, O God of Peace, take oath,
That War be toppled from his throne.
Loosed from this tyrant's baneful reign
We can arise as men made free,
And march unarmed beneath the flag
Of our restored humanity.

MARGUERITE EMILIO.

The Study Table

Fathers and Sons

This last collection* of chapters by distinguished American men and women confirms the genius which Sydney Strong has displayed in a number of recent volumes which he has edited. Mr. Strong knows what matters are of intense human interest and also who the persons are that the public would most like to hear from, on these themes. In the little volume under review, educators, clergymen, business men, a publicist, a politician, etc., all tell the story of their spiritual heritage. The creation of genius is a subject that always piques curiosity. To know something about how such persons as Jane Addams, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Haynes Holmes or Oswald Villard, came to be what they are is a matter that anyone, young or old, who feels possibilities welling up within, is eager to discover. The curiosity which the book awakens results in a valuable revelation. We know that our physical endowment may be directly traced. We are less certain that our spiritual endowment has its ancestry. If the study here made could be carried on through a number of generations and include the mothers as well, we would have a literature of eugenic significance which might replace the futile geneaological researches as astronomy has replaced astrology.

The first fact that emerges from reading the score of acknowledgements is that every one of these distinguished men and women did owe their fathers much. There is no Topsy who "just growed" among them. Spiritual qualities which are recognized in the authors are qualities that appear in their fathers even in the instances where circumstances and events prevented any significant manifestation of those qualities. Not only such elements of character but very often specific enthusiasms, causes and ideals were the absorbing interests of the fathers and have been but given fuller service by the fathers' distinguished children. Alice Stone Blackwell's father, through the inspiration of his wife, devoted his life to the cause of Woman Suffrage. Stephen Wise's father preceded him as Rabbi, apostle of liberal Judaism and ardent Zionist. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pre-eminently a tutor for confused youth in the new day, had a father who through his long life of teaching in Buffalo, both inspired and clarified the minds of countless youth. We all know why Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., is Governor of Porto Rico. It is almost to be expected that John Haynes Holmes' father should have been enthralled by the orators of his day, was more interested in the intellectual side of religion than piety and took a turn at professional acting. Men of affairs, such as Roger Babson, and Edward Filene naturally speak of outstanding virtues such as perseverance in hard work, the necessity of thinking clearly, and to bear untoward circumstances uncomplainingly. To me there was great interest in Samuel A. Eliot's revelation of the more intimate side of President Eliot's life, and any one anxious to know how to bring up a self reliant progressive minded, free-spirited boy could do no better than read this chapter.

The book is certain to make a universal appeal. There is enough of the hero-worship quality in it to stir the adolescent boy or girl. Used as material for ethical training, it would aid children in appreciation, which often does not come until mature life and when it is too late for the establishment of the richly rewarding relationship with those appreciated. It will likewise serve to bring to consciousness the indebtedness which we all have, of which self esteem often prevents the recognition.

I found myself realizing in a way that I had not before, how recently removed from the pioneer stage the generation in the midst of affairs today is. Not until you see brought together in one volume biographies of the generation just behind us, are you conscious that it was less than a century ago that the covered wagon was still winding its way over the rough muddy roads of the West, and there was free land in abundance for the hardy settler. It is reassuring to our impatience to know that our present, as yet untamed civilization is a mere infant. If the qualities which were possessed by these men of a generation ago are still to be found among us, what they poured into the establishment of homesteads, the securing of freedom for the slave, the winning of rights for women can, by us, be poured into the re-ordering of our society for the winning of an America that means a more even-handed justice for all. And the burden of this little book is, that there is a preservation of spiritual qualities across the generations. We may look confidently for the leaders of the new day. The leaders of today are their promise.

JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP.

*"What I Owe to My Father." Edited by Sydney Strong. Published by Henry Holt & Co. $1.50.

Correspondence

Re The MacDonald Government

Editor of UNITY:

I have just been reading your issue of May 25 and must confess to some alarm at the views expressed in your editorial on the subject of our present government.

You have watched with attention as close as that of any Englishman the handling of the Indian situation by the MacDonald government. Leaving out of account the arrogant and bombastic speeches of our "Labor" ministers on the subject, and confining yourself purely to their actions, are you prepared to say that (whatever the differences existing in *policies*) there is any difference in *principle* between this and former governments?

The Indian crisis is a vital phase in a universal struggle. India today is the battleground on which the fundamental principles of government are at war. The issue is infinitely more important than any "domestic" issue (such as the land tax, which you mention) or any question of intergovernmental relations. Its superior importance arises from the fact that, whereas these other issues concern the *use* of power and authority, the Indian issue concerns the very nature and *origin* of that authority. Beside the political slavery of 300 million people, the affairs of 40 millions sink into comparative unimportance.

It is not my wish to analyze the personal motives of those responsible for the present repression in India. I would not even go so far as you and impute "unscrupulous cunning" to Mr. Lloyd George or "amiable weakness" to Mr. Baldwin. All that I would suggest is that the same actions which lead you to apply these adjectives to the Liberal and Tory leaders have led others to apply similar epithets to Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues. Indeed, if they are to be exonerated from the charge of "unscrupulous cunning" it is difficult to see how they can escape that of weakness, whether "amiable" or otherwise. They have met the Indian claims for justice by a determination "to govern," written in murder and oppression. Their fairest speeches have all made it clear that the time and

quantity of self-government to be enjoyed by India is a matter of which they intend to be the final judges. Driven by the irresistible force of Indian nationalism, they have indeed retreated, but only so far as they have been compelled. They have made every effort to placate the princes and the landed interests, allying themselves with the most reactionary influences in India. They have hedged round the forthcoming conference with reservations on foreign relations, defence, financial "obligations" and all that conserves our ill-gotten "interests."

For reasons that are difficult to understand Mahatma Gandhi is now preparing to parley with this government. The mandate given to him at Karachi to accept nothing less than *Purna Swaraj* is in direct contradiction to the position taken by Mr. Wedgewood Benn when questioned recently in the House of Commons with regard to "safeguards." Nevertheless, Gandhi himself has admitted in reply to a letter of my own in *Young India* that *there is no change of heart* on the part of our government.

Democracy is not merely a system of government. It is a great moral truth, which (once realized) alters one's whole course of action. Those who have realized the truth of Gandhi's ideals must feel that they must yield to his demands or sacrifice power and position in whole-hearted co-operation with him. Their position will be as absolute (and as insane from the world's point of view) as that of the pacifists in the war.

MacDonald and his supporters, on the other hand, have continually acted upon the old maxims of "government by law established," assuming their own right to choose what was good for India in defiance of Indian opinion. That is putting the kindest possible construction upon their actions. Their very position, accepting office with a parliamentary minority, implied their willingness to work systems in which they professed disbelief and to do the will of those whose political morality they were supposed to abhor. At the Round Table Conference, under such circumstances as these, the alternatives are simple. If the justice of India's demand is recognized, the government will be thrown out on an issue upon which they should have fallen gloriously eighteen months ago. In so far as the conference is "successful" it can only be so by satisfying the "unscrupulous cunning" of Mr. Lloyd George.

For these reasons many of us are far from giving our "support and blessing" to the present cabinet. What we need is the conversion of England; and if ever that is achieved neither Baldwin, Lloyd George nor MacDonald will be "the one man" to meet Mahatma Gandhi in a conference, unless they too are converted. And viewing them as impartially as possible I cannot see that one is either more or less in need of that conversion than the others.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

Benson, nr. Oxford, England

Karachi and the Round Table Conference

Editor of UNITY:

Since you are interested in first-hand knowledge about the Indian situation, I think it a sacred duty to inform you as best as I can of my impressions of the Karachi Congress which I had the privilege of attending. I know that there is sufficient ground for an honest difference of opinion. However, I feel called upon to make a few observations here about the Truce.

I suppose there is nothing in the world about which greater misunderstanding prevails today than the Gandhi-Irwin Truce and its implications. India has taken the Truce as an accomplished fact without seeking now to judge its merits or demerits; it is no use flogging a dead horse. Whatever may be its true significance, the Indian people are resolved to hatch out good from the muddle. Whether it has been a blunder or not, the Indian people mean to mend it in such a way that ultimate good may result from it. I suppose you realize that a people who can turn their defeats into victories can never be subdued. I do not mean that the Truce is a defeat; it is on the other hand a recognition of the supremacy of the Congress. But there can be real question whether to stay the arms when victory was within grasp, was a wise step. In this sense there is doubt about its wisdom—though personally I do not doubt it—but good will come even from evil at the hand of Mahatmaji. In him we have ever confided; in him we will ever confide.

Recently I was returning from a hill station and Sjt. Jairamdas Doulatram, the Secretary of the Congress and a member of the Congress Working Committee, was traveling in the same train. One of us went to him and had a heart to heart talk with him. He informed the visitor that Mahatmaji means and is keen on restarting the campaign on the failure of the second Round Table Conference. My reading is that ere long the second Round Table Conference will fail as surely as the first. Perchance the Labor Government will be thrown out of office and the Conservatives will be occupying the Treasury benches. Another year of stiff fight is ahead before India can get anything from Britain.

I am enclosing a blood-curdling account of an outrage perpetrated under the aegis of the British Government. I suppose you have never heard or dreamed of a worse outrage. The worst tyrannies of the most barbarous rulers were a thousand times better than the one narrated herewith. That this happens in the year 1930 of His Grace under the flag of a civilized government, of a Christian nation of Europe simply establishes the irresponsibilities of a foreign and absentee rule. That the officers knew it, or could have known it if they had kept their eyes open, simply testifies that India can no longer tolerate the continuance of this government and its machinery.

GOVINDLAL D. SHAH

Ahmedabad, India

The Churches and the War Game

Editor of UNITY:

I do not write to take issue with the editorial in UNITY on June 8 concerning the recent aerial maneuvers of the War Department. In the main your position is surely sound. The protests against these military displays were, as you say, "few and far between." There are certain facts which in all justice to the churches should appear in UNITY,—facts which I assume were not brought to your attention before UNITY went to press.

The American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting in Tremont Temple, Boston, on May 19, passed a resolution condemning the air maneuvers with surprisingly little opposition. A similar resolution was passed by the Massachusetts State Convention of Universalists meeting at Gloucester on May 21. Both resolutions, please note, were passed only a few days prior to the air maneuvers over the city of Boston and when, therefore, the interest of the public in the matter was at its highest. Also I personally know of two ministers here in Massachusetts who preached sermons protesting against the maneuvers which received some notice in the press.

But again, in the main, your contention is correct. We may well wonder why it was that those 12,076 clergymen who recently expressed the opinion that the churches of America should refuse to sanction any future war were almost all silent in regard to this recent issue of the militarists!

Haverhill, Massachusetts NORMAN D. FLETCHER

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 290)

the approach of its struggles in the light of non-violence and love-force, with the consequent promotion of peace and unity through their supreme power.

All-World Gandhi Fellowship, through its director, Mr. Kedar Nath Das Gupta, has planned during the summer of 1931 an Appreciation Tour of Europe. A group of members and friends are to visit England during Mahatma Gandhi's proposed visit to London as an important figure at the Round Table Conference. This group will travel in a very inexpensive way and follow the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi, living in the simplest fashion possible. The tour will extend to other European countries as well. The Fellowship's idea in forming this study group has as its purpose the deeper understanding which comes through the closer contact with the culture, art life and peoples of other boundaries, helping in this way to make boundaries boundless, as All-World Gandhi Fel-

lowship believes that "thought builds the universe." The tour is scheduled to leave New York July 16, 1931, returning October 12.

Membership involves an initiation fee of $1.00 and a yearly contribution which is left to the good will of the individual member, for which they receive the magazine *Dharma*. The application for membership in the All-World Gandhi Fellowship should be sent to the Secretary, Suite 417, 105 East 22d Street, New York City.

Statement of Facts

in the Scottsboro Case as Investigated by George Chamlee, Attorney of Chattanooga, Tennessee

The boys were arrested at Paint Rock, Alabama, on March 25th, arraigned on the same day and committed to jail without bond on a charge of rape. Judge Hawkins immediately called a special term of the grand jury which convened on March 30th, immediately indicted the boys and committed them to jail, all in one day. Judge Hawkins set the trial for April 6, horse-swapping day, calling in a special term of court for this day when thousands of outsiders would be in the town. In three days all the boys were convicted and sentenced to the electric chair, with the exception of Roy Wright, who is only 14 years old, and was turned over to juvenile authorities, who are to return him to the court for trial and sentence if he is found to be "incorrigible." In two weeks, without being given time to prepare their defense or take as their lawyer other than those appointed by the court itself and a thoroughly undependable lawyer sent from Chattanooga, the boys were sentenced to a legal lynching.

The facts as thus far gathered are: Andy Wright, Roy Wright, Haywood Patterson and Eugene Williams, are friends and from Chattanooga, boarded the freight train in their city on the way to Memphis in search of work. Olin Montgomery was travelling alone, Norris and Weems were traveling together, as were Willie Robinson and Ozie Powell. None of these groups knew each other; they met for the first time when they were taken off the train at Paint Rock. When taken off the train they were taken off in four different groups and from four different cars, widely separated on the train which consisted of about 45 cars.

At about 12:30, near Stevenson, a fight started between white and colored boys, in a gondola. The white boys evidently got the worst of the argument and hopped off the train at a point outside of Stevenson, which is about 18 miles from Paint Rock. About ten minutes after the white boys jumped off, the colored boys who had participated in the fight also hopped off the freight.

The train stopped at Paint Rock, where two groups of armed deputies on each side of the train combed the train from engine to caboose, and rounded up everybody they could find on the train. The round-up resulted in the nine boys and the two girls dressed in overalls. None of the boys had seen the girls before or knew on what part of the train they were located.

At the time of the arrest, the deputy, who had evidently deputized the others, stated that he was picking them all up for hoboing. The nine boys were confronted with the two girls at Paint Rock. The sheriff asked the two girls if these boys had done anything to them and the girls answered no.

They were all taken to Scottsboro in autos. In the Scottsboro jail, the sheriff continued to confront the boys with the girls and kept yelling and insisting that the girls identify these boys as having attacked them. The girls refused on several occasions, then made indefinite charges, but were finally bull-dozed into making the rape charges.

It is reported that the white boys, who were forced off the train at Stevenson, had someone telephone ahead to stop the train and get the Negro boys who had forced them off. The deputy's posse stopped the train to arrest the Negro boys who had fought the white boys; instead they found the nine defendants, who remained on the train because they did not participate in any fight and had nothing to fear. When the two white girls were also found on the same train, the immediate lynch law cry of "attacking a white woman" was set up.

On the evening of the first day of the trial, when it was evident that the state had no case against the boys the sheriff beat Norris and told him that if he did not take the stand and confess he would never get off the stand alive, but if he turned states evidence he would let him go. Norris, intimidated and believing the promises, took the stand the next day and "confessed" against the other defendants.

The two girls, Victoria Price and Ruby Bates are notorious prostitutes. Ruby Bates had previously been arrested for "hugging" a Negro on one of the main streets of Chattanooga.

From the very day of the arrest everything was done to rouse lynch spirit, and create the atmosphere for the lynching in the courthouse by the State of Alabama. The state kept its compact with the mob and the defense lawyers—no lynching by a mob providing the boys were sent to a speedy chair lynching. These facts will be conclusively shown in the records of the trial.

Emergency Defense Committee, 80 *East 11th Street, New York City.*

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

HUMANIST RELIGION

By Curtis W. Reese

The Macmillan Company

"In *Humanist Religion* Mr. Reese speaks with frank sincerity and fearless forthrightness which has become characteristic of his writing on religion. There is no danger of misunderstanding him and no doubt as to his self-commitment to the program he proposes. More than most of the modern humanists he has escaped the haunting nostalgia for the securities and consolations of the dear, dead faith of other days. He is glad and eager in the naturalistic world with its pluralism and tentativeness because he is confident that man may, if he will, transform the natural-social environment to embody his desired values and, moreover, he has faith that man *will* when once he has cast off the anchorage to ultimates and eternals and accepted responsibility for the religious task.

"The test of the naturalistic humanist is in the degree of his manifestation of the scientific attitude and spirit. Among other things this involves tolerance, sympathy, historical perspective, and appreciation of how things and people came to be as they are. Mr. Reese meets this test well. He has definite and firm convictions but he does not meet dogmatism with dogmatism. There is no iconoclasm here. He is at ease in the new humanistic climate, and surveys theologies and ecclesiasticisms with quiet understanding."

—A. Eustace Haydon

Price $1.00
Order direct from *Curtis W. Reese*
700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago